



University College London

St. Nahum

Author(s): Methodie Kusseff

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 29, No. 72 (Dec., 1950), pp. 139-152

Published by: the Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London,
School of Slavonic and East European Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204193>

Accessed: 18-09-2016 15:01 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Modern Humanities Research Association, University College London, University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*

ST. NAHUM

NAHUM was a close friend of Clement, the first Bulgarian-speaking bishop in Macedonia, and worked together with him at the end of the 9th and early 10th century to promote the spread of the newly-created Slavonic literature. It is unfortunate that no works of his own have yet been discovered. It may be that in his modesty he never attempted to write anything, but he certainly encouraged and inspired those around him to write, and some of their works have come down to us. Nahum had the honour to work in both schools—in North-East Bulgaria and in Macedonia—which grew up during the reigns of Boris and Simeon. It is probable that under his wise guidance the former school was founded and developed. This school produced some brilliant scholars. When Clement was made bishop, Nahum continued his enormous task of educating the Slavonic masses in Macedonia. About his early life nothing is known. We hear of him first in the *Vita S. Clementis*,¹ which tells us that, after the death of Methodius, a severe persecution of his disciples broke out in Moravia. The leaders Gorazd, Clement, Laurence, Nahum, Angelarius and others were imprisoned, tortured and later taken by soldiers and banished from the country.

Clement took Nahum and Angelarius with him and started in the direction of the Danube.² After crossing the river they arrived in Belgrade and presented themselves to the governor (βοριτακάνος) of the city. Realising their importance he sent them immediately to Boris. The latter received them with great honour, gave them clerical garments and placed Clement and Nahum in the house of Ekhach (ἐχάτζης), the *samses*. Angelarius went to Cheslav, but he soon died. In accordance with Boris's plans, Clement was sent to Kutmichevitsa in Macedonia, where he undertook educational and missionary work on a large scale. But from here the *Vita S. Clementis* leaves the story of Nahum and concentrates exclusively on the work of Clement.

The next reliable document to continue the life of Nahum is the old *Vita S. Naoum*, written in Church Slavonic by a pupil of Clement. It narrates that when Clement was made bishop, Nahum taught

¹ A Greek document usually attributed to Theophilact, Archbishop of Ochrida. For a detailed account of it see *St. Clement of Ochrida, The Slavonic and East European Review*, December 1948, pp. 196–201.

² Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 126, col. 1220, *Vita S. Clementis*: Κλήμης μέντοι Ναούμ συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Ἀγγελάριον τὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἰστρον φέρουσιν ὠδεύει.

in his place. But this event did not take place until 893. Therefore we do not know exactly what Nahum did from 886—when he and Clement arrived in Bulgaria—until 893. According to the traditional view Boris asked Nahum to organise and direct an academic circle at the newly-built monastery of St. Panteleimon situated at the “mouth of the river Ticha.”³ Here, too, worked Simeon who later became its patron, Bishop Constantine, the monk Tudor and others. Nahum was the *εργοδιόκτης*, urging his distinguished scholars to write. In his introduction to the “Sunday Homilies on the Gospels,” Bishop Constantine says:

Сего ради и азъ умаленыи Константинъ, утврѣженъ бывъ на се твоими прошньи, брате Науме, и сими повеленьми речеными прежде, к твоѣму сѣмирению преклонихъся.

(For this reason I, the humble Constantine, being persuaded of this by your entreaties, brother Nahum, and by the above-mentioned commandments, have submitted to your meekness.)⁴

Thus, according to the traditional view, Nahum had spent seven years in North-East Bulgaria, where he worked and preached. Both the Greek *Vita* and the service in his honour place his work among the Moesians, and there he is called “the glory of the Bulgarians and the Moesians,” and it is stressed that he preached Christianity among the latter with great success.⁵ He went to Macedonia to carry on the work of Clement. Here, beside the White (Ochrida) Lake, narrates the old *Vita S. Naoum*, he built a monastery and the church of the Holy Archangels. According to the second *Vita S. Naoum*⁶—written in the 16th century in Church Slavonic—the initiative and the money were provided by Boris and Simeon. In Macedonia he taught for seven years and afterwards returned to his monastery, where he lived for ten years and died on 23 December 910. Before his death he took monastic vows. The second *Vita S. Naoum* states that his lifelong friend Bishop Clement buried him in the right wing of the church.

³ Between 1909 and 1911 excavations were made in the district of Patleina south-east of the present town of Preslav, on the right bank of the river Kamchia (i.e. Ticha). Though I. Gospodinov, who was in charge of the excavations, could not come to any definite conclusions, V. N. Zlatarski (“Kām istoriyata na otkritiya v Patleina monastir,” *Izv. na Bālg. arkh. Institut*, Sofia, 1921–1922, pp. 147–62) argues that this was the site of the monastery of St. Panteleimon.

⁴ B. Angelov i M. Genov, *Stara Bālgarska literatura (IX–XVIII)*, Sofia, 1922, p. 88.

⁵ See ‘Ακολουθία, τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ναοῦμ τοῦ θανματοργοῦ ἐν Μοσχολέει (1742 edition): *Βουλγαρέων τε, Μυσῶν τε κλέος ὁ Ναοῦμ* (p. 51); . . . προσαγαγὼν τῷ κυρίῳ σου κόσμον Μυσίας καὶ τῷ κηρύγματι καὶ τοῖς θάνασι (p. 51).

⁶ See below.

The festival held in his memory is on 23 December, but as it was in the winter season, many people were unable to attend because of the cold weather. For this reason the council of the Archbishop of Ochrida decided in 1720 to transfer it to June 20 (. . . *να μετατέθῃ ἀπο τὴν κγ' τοῦ δεκεμβρίου μηνὸς . . . εἰς τὸ ἑξῆς κατὰ τὴν κ' ἡμέραν τοῦ ἰουνίου μηνός*).⁷

As already mentioned, no written work of Nahum has been found, in spite of the important part which he played in the life of the two centres of Slavonic culture in Bulgaria. We have, however, three *vitae*—the old, the second and the Greek. The first two are written in Church Slavonic and the third in Greek. All of them will be discussed. For lack of better names these terms will be preserved throughout. The first is a very important document, and it will be considered at some length. It was discovered in 1906 in the Zograph monastery, Mount Athos, by Professor I. Ivanov.⁸ It will be seen later on that it was written by a pupil of Clement, and gives some very important facts concerning the disciples of Methodius after they had fled from Moravia. Its facts are confirmed by other sources and especially by the *Vita S. Clementis*.

There are several points which arise from the introduction of this *Vita*. To begin with, it starts very abruptly, and the name of Clement is introduced as if the reader is expected to be already acquainted with it. Further on, similar points occur: "the same devout Tsar Simeon." Moreover the writer stresses more than once that he has tried to collect more material on *both* fathers, but without success. This evidence makes us suspect that another life of Clement, by the same author, preceded the present document. In it the writer of the *Vita S. Clementis* found much material. If we accept this theory we can reconcile the discrepancies in the latter, for the *Vita S. Clementis* is written in the third person, except in a few places, where the writer speaks of himself as an intimate disciple of Clement,⁹ exactly as in the *Vita S. Naoum*.

⁷ I. Ivanov, *Bălgarski starini*, Sofia, 1932, p. 310.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 305. Professor Ivanov says: "[The *Vita*] is to be found on p. 308, in prologue No. 47, copied in the 15th c. by the Rev. Ivan Miloshev and his brother Nicholas in the village of Piskopil, county of Debur."

P. A. Lavrov and G. A. Il'yinsky also found the *Vita S. Naoum* in the same monastery. See P. A. Lavrov, "Zhitiya Sv. Nauma Okhridskago i sluzhba yemu" (*Izvestiya otdel. russ. yazyka i slovesnosti*, tom. XII, kn. 4, pp. 1-51), also F. Dvorník, *Les légendes de Constantin et Méthode* (Prague, 1933), p. 345, and *Les slaves, Byzance et Rome* (Paris, 1926), p. 298.

⁹ ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ ἀναξίους οἰκειοτέρους τῶν ἄλλων διὰ σπλάγχνα τῆς χρηστότητος ἐποιήσατο, καὶ πάντοτε συνῆμεν αὐτῷ πᾶσι παρακολουθοῦντες οἷς ἐπαρτεν, οἷς ἔλεγεν, οἷς δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἐδίδασκεν (Patr. Gr., ch. 18, col. 1225), and yet the very same writer speaks of Clement's works as follows: Φέρονται γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα παρὰ τοῖς φιλοπόνοις σωζόμενα (*ibid.*, ch. 22, col. 1229).

Мица, дикеврта, кр. паметъ нрповнаго ѡца ншого Наѡма :

И се же братіе да не останаеъ везъ памети, крѣтъ сего блаженнаго Климентъ. и съ подроугъ и сьстрѣстника. съ нимъ же и постра многын вѣды и стрѣти ѡ ірѣтигъ, Наоѡмъ презвѣтеръ сѣ.

Югда поставише іепѡна Климентъ. таждѣ вѣговѣрніи црѣ Симѡнъ, пѣсти Наоѡма подроуга іемоу въ нѣго мѣсто на вѣчитѣство. И ткѣ, таждѣ подкѣзаніа на вѣооугодіе творѣ прѣкѣваше. дѣѣство имѣвъ ѡ дѣѣства и до кончины. сътвори сѣ монастырь на исхода Бѣлаго іэіра црѣвъ стѣхъ Архѣгѣлъ и прѣкѣвъ въ оуѣчитѣствѣ, з. лѣ. прости сѣ оуѣчитѣства. и шѣ въ монастырь пожн, і. лѣтъ. И на кончинѡу своѡ пріѣтъ чрѣнчѣскѣи ѡбѣразъ. тако почн ѡ гѣ, со мѣроу мица дикеврта. крѣ. И сѣ же да е вѣдомо. прѣже з лѣтъ почн Наоѡмъ презвѣтеръ вѣпѡна Климентъ.

И сѣ же вѣдомо коуди вѣсѣмъ почитающѣмъ іакоже прѣже написахѡ. іако ірѣтіи ѡны моуѣише мѣно. а дроугѣ продѣше Жѣдомъ на цѣнѣ презвѣтеры и діакони. Ты же Жѣдомѣ поѣише и вѣдоше къ Бѣнѣткомъ, и вънѣгда продѣхоу і по строѣнію сѣію. прѣндѣ же тогда црѣ моужѣ къ Бѣнѣткомъ, ѡ Константѣина грѣда. црѣ дѣло дѣлае. И вѣдѣвъ о нѣ и ѡвѣнхъ іскоуѣи црѣ моужѣ и ѡвѣнхъ тако поѣмъ. вѣ въ Константѣнъ грѣдъ. і сказа ѡ нѣ црѣ Касѣлію. И вѣстроіше іѣ пакы въ своѣ чины. і сѣны презвѣтеры и діаконы, іакоже і прѣже вѣше. и оуѣрѡкъ дѣше. і нѣктоже въ рѣботѡу не оуѣмрѣ. нѣ оѣи въ Константѣнѣ грѣдѣ. црѣми набѣдѣи покой пріѣше. ѡвѣи въ Бѣлѣгѣрскоу землю прѣнѣше съ великою чѣстію покой пріѣше.

И Морѣвскаа земля, іакоже вѣ прорѣкалъ сѣын Мѣѡдіѣ архѣпѣскопъ. за вѣзакѡнѣ дѣлама дѣлъ нхъ, і вѣрѣсѣ. И за нѣгмѣнѣ прѣвоѣѣрѣнѣхъ ѡцѣ. и за стрѣти нхѣже пріѣше ѡ вѣрѣтѣкъ. нѣмѣже ѡны вѣрѣѡваше, въ скорѣ мѣстѣ пріѣше ѡ вѣгѣ. Не по мѣнозѣ же лѣтѣ прѣідоше Оуѣгрі пѣѡнѣскѣи ѣзыкъ. и попѣлѣнѣше землю и нѣ оѣпоуѣстише ю. нхѣже бѡ не попѣлѣнѣше Оуѣгрі. то въ Бѣлѣгѣры вѣѣжаашѣ. и ѡстаа земля нхъ поуѣста Оуѣгромъ въ вѣлѣстѣ.

Из же братіе. ѡказѣнѣи мѣногѡу печѡлъ и пѣмѣти блѣженѣи ѡцѣ ншѣ радѣ. хѡтѣще ѡбѣрѣсти жѣтіѣ нхъ вѣсѣ написѣнно. нѣже ѡ начала бѣше вѣѣлы вѣсѣ жѣтіѣ нѣ. іако на дѣлѣхъ и до кончины, и не ѡбѣрѣтохъ. мѣло бѡ азъ вѣдѣ. ѡіко же мѣ сами блѣженѣи ѡцѣ сказаашѣ. и нѣждахъ сѣ писѣти и не смѣѣдѣ. хѡтѣ вѣще ѡбѣрѣсти написѣнно. Да и нѣще аще кто ѡбѣрѣщѣтъ нѣнѣмѣи написѣно. да не зазрѣтъ насѣ вѣбогѣнхъ и гроуѣнхъ. вѣ бѡ іако мѣножае сѣго сѣтъ сътвориѣи ѡѣи. и знамѣнѣа сътвориѣи¹⁾ мѣногаа. нѣ сѣ іѣліко намѣ сказаашѣ. а дроугѣ потѣише за смѣрѣніѣ нѣ.

Се же самъ доноудѣхъ се. паче же вѣка ме поощити. иже и такоже сего блаженнаго Кlementa оученикъ бывъ. Мѣрко инокъ бывъ въ Деволѣнѣ епископѣ. четвертѣи епископъ въ Славенскѣи ѣзыкъ бы Дѣвола. Надѣхъ се въ се ѿ блаженныѣ ѿ ѿщѣ молитвы и милость пріѣти, і вѣгъ и оставленіе грѣхъ въ ѿ мѣтивааго вѣ нѣшего. иже рѣ пріемлюи прѣрка въ имѣ прѣрче. мѣзоу прѣрчу пріеме. и пріемлюи прѣведника въ имѣ прѣведниче. мѣзоу прѣведничу пріиметь.¹⁾ И пакы рече бжѣствѣи дѣль Пѣвелъ. помнитѣ игоумены вѣше иже глѣше кѣмъ слово бжѣе. иже вѣзѣрающе на скончаніе житіа. подѣщи се вѣроу.²⁾ Тѣмъ же и мы вѣратѣ, подѣимъ се вѣлѣнныи сѣхъ добромѣу житію. иже двѣство и чистотѣу вѣсоу сѣхъра-нише. многыи вѣдѣи и напасти постраше правѣе вѣрѣи бжѣа дѣла. да и мы сѣ нѣми вѣчѣнаа вѣгаа оулоучимъ. ѿ хѣ ісѣ гѣи нѣшемъ. емоу же нѣсть сла ѿцѣу и стѣмъ дѣхѣу. и нѣа и прісно и вѣ вѣкы вѣкомъ, аминъ: ~

¹⁾ Въ рѣкописахъ: сѣтворѣи.

²⁾ Мат. X, 40—41.

³⁾ Евр. XIII, 7.

The 23rd day of the month of December—in remembrance of our Venerable Father Nahum.

And, brethren, may this presbyter, Nahum, brother, comrade and fellow-sufferer of the blessed Clement, with whom he underwent many disasters and sufferings at the hands of the heretics, not remain unremembered.

After he had appointed Clement to be bishop, the same devout Tsar Simeon allowed Nahum, the friend of Clement, to teach in his stead. And Nahum stayed and strove after things that are acceptable to God. From childhood till death, preserving his chastity, he built this monastery and the Church of the Holy Archangels at the exit of the White Lake, and he taught for seven years. After he had done with teaching he went to a monastery, where he dwelt for ten years. At the end of his life he took monastic vows. Thus he passed away in the Lord in peace on the 23rd day of the month of December. And let this be known that the presbyter Nahum died six years before Bishop Clement.

And let it be known to all who esteem him, as we have written before, that the heretics tortured these men sorely, and the others—priests and deacons—they sold to the Jews at a price. And the Jews took them, and brought them to Venice, and sold them in accordance with Divine

Providence. Then came the Emperor's messenger from Constantinople to Venice on the Emperor's business. And when he heard of these men he bought some of them, and others he took also, and led them to Constantinople, and told the Emperor Basil of them. And they reinstated them again in their ranks and dignities as presbyters and deacons, as they were before, and they gave them benefices, and none died in slavery, but some, protected by the Emperor, found rest in Constantinople, and others came to the land of Bulgaria and found rest with great honour.

And the land of Moravia soon suffered the vengeance of God, as the Archbishop St. Methodius had foretold, for the lawless deeds and heresies committed by their people, and for banishing the faithful fathers, and for the sufferings the latter endured from the heretics [i.e. the German clergy], in whom they believed. Not many years after came the Ugrians [Magyars], a peon people, seized the land and laid it waste. Those whom the Ugrians did not capture escaped into Bulgaria. Their land remained desolate under the rule of the Ugrians.

But I, brethren, am afflicted with much sorrow on account of the remembrance of our blessed Fathers, for I wished to find, but could not, the complete account of their lives written down by those who from the beginning had known their entire lives in detail until their death. For I knew little, only as much as the blessed Fathers had told me. I intended to write, but did not dare, hoping to find some further written account. But if someone should discover anything written by others he must not reproach us, poor and ignorant as we are, for he knows that the fathers have done more than this and performed many miracles.¹⁰ But this is as much as they told us, and the rest they concealed because of their humility.

For this reason I undertook this myself, the more so as the bishop encouraged me, who was also a pupil of the blessed Clement—Marko who was bishop of the diocese of Devol, and the fourth Slav-speaking bishop in Devol. For we hoped to receive of these blessed Fathers prayers, grace and forgiveness of sins by our merciful God, who has said: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward."¹¹ And Paul, the divine apostle, has also said: "Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God, and considering the issue of their life imitate their faith."¹² Let us therefore brethren imitate the good life of these blessed fathers who preserved their chastity and cleanness and suffered many disasters for the true faith of God, so that with them we may receive everlasting blessing through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, both now and for evermore. Amen.

¹⁰ In the MS. "he performed."

¹¹ Matt. x, 40-41.

¹² Hebr. xiii, 7.

It is clear that the writer links Nahum closely with Clement, whom he calls the "brother, comrade and fellow-sufferer" of the former. Some scholars have interpreted "brother" in the strictly literal sense,¹³ but it seems that it has a wider meaning here such as "brother in Christ." Otherwise, as I. Ivanov explains, this would have been expressed by such a phrase as "по плѣти братъ."¹⁴

The heretics who persecuted Nahum and Clement are the German clergy of Moravia. They are called heretics on account of their belief in the *Filioque* clause and the heresy of the three tongues.

When Simeon began his reign, Clement had already made himself famous throughout Macedonia. His missionary work bore excellent results, and his educational activities proved a great success. In 893 in appreciation of his services we read in the *Vita S. Clementis* (ch. 20) that Simeon arranged that Clement ἐπίσκοπος Δρεμβίτζας ἦτοι Βελίτζας προβάλλεται, καὶ οὕτω δὴ Βουλγάρῳ γλώσσῃ πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος ὁ Κλήμης καθίσταται (was promoted to be Bishop of Drembitsa and Belitsa, and thus Clement became the first Bulgarian-speaking bishop).¹⁵

Clement's post as teacher in South-West Macedonia was taken by his friend Nahum.¹⁶ Maybe the latter begged the king for this post, and Simeon "allowed" the two old friends to live near each other. In the new post Nahum's life was exemplary in every respect. He taught for seven years, after which he went to the monastery which he himself had built. The Lake of Ochrida is called the "White" lake; its Greek name was λυχνυδία λίμνη, which is mentioned as a district in the second *Vita S. Naoum*. The monastery became famous soon after the death of Nahum, and its name was changed from the "Holy Archangels" to that of its founder. It has survived until the present day. Throughout the centuries it has been a centre of both Bulgarian and Greek literary activity, which began soon after its foundation. Special attention was paid to the cult of St. Clement and St. Nahum, and at the same time the two masters, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, together with their other disciples, were held in high honour.

Nahum came to Bulgaria as a priest. According to his second *Vita*, Nahum and Clement were ordained priests in Rome by Adrian.

¹³ N. L. Tunitsky, *Sv. Kliment, episkop Slovenskiy* (Sergiyev Posad, 1913), p. 94, and P. A. Lavrov, "Zhitiya . . .," p. 38.

¹⁴ I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

¹⁵ Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, col. 1228.

¹⁶ See F. Dvorník, *Les slaves . . .*, p. 317.

The *Translatio S. Clementis*¹⁷ and the *Vita S. Clementis*¹⁸ affirm that disciples of Cyril and Methodius were made priests and deacons without specifying any names. Like his great teacher Cyril he became a monk before his death, and as such he is portrayed on the walls of the old churches in Macedonia. Particularly striking is his figure on an old seal, where he is also shown as a monk—tall, slim, with a long beard and clothed in a monastic *soutane*.¹⁹

Nahum died six years before his friend Clement, who, according to the *Vita S. Clementis*, died in 916. The Greek *Vita S. Naoum*, among other errors, also states that Clement died first while he was archbishop in Moravia. This could not be so because of the events which followed Pope Stephen V's letter to Svatopluk.

After the death of Methodius in 885 two parties were formed in Moravia—one by the German clergy headed by Wiching, which eventually had the support of Pope Stephen and Svatopluk, the other led by Gorazd and Clement, who relied on Byzantium for support. The controversial points were the *Filioque* clause, the heresy of the three tongues, fasting on Saturday and, most important of all, who was to be Archbishop of Moravia, Wiching or Gorazd.

Since both the Pope and Svatopluk upheld the first party the disciples of Methodius lost their cause.²⁰ The *Vita S. Clementis* narrates how the leaders, including Nahum, were imprisoned, tortured and finally banished from the country. The younger ones, "the priests and deacons, were sold to the Jews at a price." The *Vita S. Clementis* confirms this fact: "Ὅσοι δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἦσαν νεώτεροι, τούτους δὴ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπώλουν. (Those of the priests and deacons who were younger they sold to the Jews.)"²¹

Slavery was practised widely in mediæval Europe, especially in

¹⁷ Multis itaque gratiarum actionibus præfato Philosopho pro tanto beneficio redditus, consecraverunt ipsum et Methodium in Episcopos, nec non et ceteros eorum discipulos in Presbyteros et Diacanos. V. A. Bil'basov, *Kiril i Meľody* (St. Petersburg, 1868), p. 225.

¹⁸ εἶτα τῶν ἐπομένων τοῖς ἀγίοις, ὅσοι καὶ Σθλοβενικῶν γραμμάτων ἱκανὴν πείραν ἔχεν καὶ βίῳ σεμνῇ κοσμηθῆναι παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων ἐμαρτυροῦντο, τοὺς μὲν τοῦ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, τοὺς δὲ τῶν διακόνων, ἐστὶ δ' οὓς καὶ ὑποδιακόνων βαθμοῦ ἡξίωσεν (Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, col. 1197).

¹⁹ Prot. Iv. Goshev, "Starite pechati na manastira Sv. Naoum in Macedonia" (*Recueil dédié à Prof. Peter Nikov*, Sofia, 1940).

²⁰ For details see:

(a) S. Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London, 1930), p. 125.

(b) F. Dvorník, *Les slaves* . . . , p. 297.

(c) F. Dvorník, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (London, 1949), p. 128. The author makes the interesting suggestion that Svatopluk declared himself against the disciples of Methodius, because he preferred the Frankish to the Greek methods of Church administration.

(d) F. Dvorník, *The Photian Schism* (Cambridge, 1948), p. 215.

²¹ Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, cols. 1213–1216.

the second half of the 9th century.²² Venice had a large slave market and supplied many countries with slaves, including the Saracens of North Africa.

While Rome was intolerant of the celebration of the liturgy in any other language but Latin, Byzantium was more sympathetic. It allowed the translation of the Bible and the liturgical books into many languages²³ and their use in the churches. The emissary who bought the disciples of Cyril and Methodius knew the Emperor's sentiments in this matter. When Methodius visited Constantinople before his death he was welcomed by both Basil and Photius with "great honour and joy." Methodius was their friend and they gave a blessing to his work. The Emperor even kept some of Methodius's priests and deacons together with their books in his city. These were joined by the new arrivals from Venice who were also given a cordial welcome, reinstated to their former ranks and their maintenance was assured. When Simeon returned to Bulgaria after his study in Constantinople he probably took with him some of these Slavonic teachers. They were just the sort of people that Boris wanted so badly, and he gave them an enthusiastic welcome. According to the traditional view the presbyter (later bishop) Constantine was among them, and he was later to prove himself to be a good scholar and poet.

The arrival of the Magyars in the land of Moravia which they "laid waste" is regarded by the author as a punishment by God for what the heretics, i.e. the German clergy, had done to Methodius's disciples. In the *Vita S. Clementis* we see that Methodius threatened Svatopluk that he would destroy not only himself but also his subjects, if he supported the heretics.²⁴ As far as Wiching and his followers were concerned he anathematised them.²⁵ That Methodius did pronounce an anathema is quite clear from the letter of Pope Stephen V to Svatopluk: "Methodium namque superstitioni, non ædificationi, contentioni non paci insistentem audientes plurimum mirati sumus; et si ita est, ut audivimus, superstitionem ejus penitus abdicamus. Anathema vero pro contemnenda catholica fide qui indixit, in caput redundabit ejus. Tu autem et populus tuus sancti Spiritus judicio eritis innoxii, si tamen fidem quam Romana prædicat Ecclesia tenueritis inviolabiliter." ²⁶ Thus it seems

²² F. Dvorník, *Les slaves* . . . , p. 299.

²³ Safarik, *Slav. drevn.*, II-12, p. 316 (Russian edition).

²⁴ Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, col. 1204. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐκφοβῶν, ὥς, εἰ τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς προσθῆται, καὶ ἑαυτὸν διαφθερεῖ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν.

²⁵ *ibid.*, col. 1208. καὶ μέντοι διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ Μεθοδίου τῷ τοῦ ἀναθέματος Σατανᾶ παραδοθέντος μετὰ τοῦ θιάσου τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ μαίνομένων.

²⁶ Patr. Lat., v. 129, cols. 803-804.

that the Pope removed the anathema from Svatopluk and his people, i.e. the supporters of Wiching.

The *Legenda Moravica* also mentions Methodius's anathema: "Quapropter in ipsum Svatopluk, frontosum principem et suos satellites, et in omnes ejus Gades excommunicationis fulminavit sententiam." ²⁷

According to the author Methodius had foretold the suffering which was to befall the Moravian land. This time, as a result of war, many of its inhabitants began their exodus towards Bulgaria, as Nahum and his friends had done earlier. This event is confirmed by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.²⁸ Once again they brought their books with them, and traces of them can be found in Bulgarian and Serbian editions.

The Magyars are called by the writer "a peon people." I. Ivanov thinks "that in this designation we must not look for ethnographical significance, because the land of the Magyars—the older Pannonia (*Παννονία*) of Byzantine writers—is confused with Pæonia (*Παιονία*)."²⁹

In the lines that follow the author gives us a sincere picture of himself and the way he wrote the present document. He belonged to the diocese of Devol, since he speaks of Bishop Marko as his superior. Of Nahum he says that he built this monastery, which makes us suppose that he wrote it in the monastery of St. Nahum. He himself, like Bishop Marko, was a disciple of Clement and the sources of his work were the "Blessed Fathers" themselves. The fact that he calls them "blessed" and not "holy" shows that he wrote after their death, but before they were canonised. In his work he was encouraged by his bishop, and he tried, in vain, to find a detailed account of the lives of these two fathers. Since, on account of their humility, they concealed parts of their life, he had to be content with what little they had told him.

But even this short account gives us so many facts which make the document of great importance for the history of the period. It is written simply and truthfully, unlike the later documents which portray the fate of Methodius's disciples.

From *Vita S. Clementis* we learn that Clement became the first Bulgarian-speaking bishop (*καὶ οὕτω δὴ Βουλγάρα γλώσσῃ πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος ὁ Χλήμης καθίσταται*).³⁰ Now we hear that Marko was the

²⁷ V. A. Bil'basov, *Kiril i Mefody*, p. 235.

²⁸ *De administrando Imperio*, ed. Bonn, cap. 41, p. 176: *καὶ οἱ ὑπολειφθέντες τοῦ λαοῦ διεσκορπίσθησαν προσφυγόντες εἰς τὰ παρακειμένα ἔθνη, εἰς τε τοὺς βουλγάρους.*

²⁹ I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

³⁰ Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, col. 1228.

fourth Slav-speaking bishop. The only other that we know of is Bishop Constantine from the Preslav school. Thus one remains unknown to us. If, however, the writer had in view Methodius as the first Slav-speaking bishop then the order would be : Methodius, Clement, Constantine and Marko.³¹

The second *Vita S. Naoum*, written in the 16th century, was found by I. Konstantinov and published by L. Kovachevich.³² Although we cannot place it on the same level, as an historical document, as the old *Vita*, nevertheless the events narrated follow a certain chronological order. Towards the end it gives us some valuable information which the writer must have drawn from a trustworthy source. Here is a brief summary of its contents :

In memory of the blessed Nahum of Livan in Devol near Ochrida. Nahum grew up in Moesia and joined Constantine the Philosopher and his brother Methodius who taught among the Moesians and Dalmatians. Nahum followed them everywhere, even to Rome. There Pope Adrian met them, and God showed miracles. After the celebration of the liturgy, [the Pope] made Constantine a monk, renamed him Cyril and ordained him priest, and Methodius was ordained archbishop of Moravia and of all Pannonia. After the liturgy [Adrian] showed the books translated by Cyril and Methodius and blessed them. The ordination as priests and deacons of Clement, Nahum and the rest of the disciples followed and [the Pope] ordered a complete service to be said in Bulgarian in the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul. Soon after, on February 14th, Cyril died in Rome, and his body was laid in the Church of St. Clement of Rome. Through miracles God honoured St. Cyril. After Methodius had received permission from the Pope he went to Pannonia with his disciples and in the town of Moravia he took the archbishopric.

After the death of Methodius a certain man Viglisko became archbishop. Filled with the Macedonian and Apollinarian heresies he tortured and imprisoned the disciples of Methodius. Through the prayers of the saints an earthquake took place, after which they were banished.

After they had raised from the dead the son of a nobleman near the Danube, they crossed the river and reached Belgrade. They were welcomed warmly by Prince Radislav. After that they separated, some going to Moesia [Мѣсїю], others to Dalmatia and Dacia.

Nahum and Clement came to the lands of Illyricum and Linhindon. At Livan in Devol, near the lake of the town of Ochrida, Nahum built a great monastery and a church in honour of Archangel Michael and the heavenly host with the support and by the order of the devout Bulgarian tsars Michael-Boris and his son Simeon, in the year 6413 [905]. And there the blessed Nahum died in old age on the 23rd of December, and

³¹ I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

³² L. Kovachevich in *Glasnik*, kn. 63 (885), pp. 1-4.

was buried by Bishop Clement of Ochrida, and his body was laid with reverence in the right wing of the church—people suffering from various diseases are healed at his grave.

It is quite clear that the second *Vita S. Naoum* is not an original document, but a compilation from various sources. It may even be the translation of a Greek document. The author did not know the old *Vita*, otherwise he would have made use of it. His main source must have been the *Vita S. Clementis*, which he follows freely and from which he borrows his main facts. As for his other sources, it is difficult to decide whether he used some of the documents already known to us by selecting a few facts and incorporating them at random in his work, or whether he wrote freely and used data current orally in his time. Professor Zlatarski³³ maintains the former view, namely, that he has used the Pannonian Legend and the Greek *Vita S. Naoum*, besides the *Vita S. Clementis*. It is, however, very unconvincing that he should have used the first two documents, since if they are closely examined and compared with the second *Vita S. Naoum*, we find that the writer does not make use of much material found in them, nor does he follow the order of events narrated in them. If we allow that the second *Vita S. Naoum* is not a translation, then, except for the last part, it seems better to accept the second suggestion that the writer freely used the *Vita S. Clementis* as his main source, and that he added to it such data as were current among his contemporaries. In the *Vita* there are two definite mistakes, namely: (a) Wiching is called "a certain magician named Viglisko," and (b) the governor (βοηταρχος) of Belgrade is called Radislav.

Towards the end the document contains some important data. Like the old *Vita S. Naoum* it maintains that Nahum built the monastery and church in honour of the Archangel Michael, but adds new evidence that it was done with the support and at the command of the two Bulgarian tsars, in the year 6413 (905),³⁴ and that Nahum was buried by Bishop Clement in the right wing of the church. How did the writer obtain this important evidence con-

³³ V. N. Zlatarski, "Slovenskoto zhitye na Sv. Nauma ot XVI. vek" (*Spisanie na Bălg. akad. na naukite*, kn. XXX, 1925), pp. 1-28.

³⁴ On this date see V. N. Zlatarski, "Slovenskoto zhitye . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12. He makes interesting observations and proves that according to Bulgarian chronology, that year was actually 900 and that, he says, agreed with the testimony of the old *Vita S. Naoum*. But the latter only implies that he went to live in his monastery in that year. (Clement died in 916; Nahum died six years earlier, in 910; Nahum lived 10 years in his monastery; hence 900.) Zlatarski's supposition is that because Nahum went to his monastery in 900, this means that the monastery was finished in that year. This may be true, but it is not supported by the old *Vita S. Naoum*. The monastery may have been finished earlier or later than 900.

cerning (a) the building of the monastery with the support of the two tsars, and (b) the burial of Nahum by Clement?

V. N. Zlatarski makes the interesting suggestion that the first evidence was obtained by the writer from an inscription over the main door of the church.³⁵ This is a common practice in the Orthodox Church and gives to the suggestion a certain probability. Since the church suffered many vicissitudes it is easy to understand that this inscription is no longer in existence.

If we accept this suggestion as probable can we not go further and suggest that the second piece of evidence was obtained by the writer from an inscription on the tomb of St. Nahum? The text reads very much like an epitaph, but we have no direct evidence to substantiate either of these suggestions. The important thing to remember is that the source from which the writer drew seems to be trustworthy.

The Greek *Vita S. Naoum* was published in the Moschopoli edition of 1742 and re-edited by Hilferding.³⁶ Its Church Slavonic translation in the Serbian edition lacks precision. It was published by P. A. Lavrov.³⁷ As an historical document it has no value. It gives us no new facts and is full of mistakes. It is based broadly on the *Vita S. Clementis*, but the writer has let his imagination go unchecked. It has a certain interest for us as a literary document, showing us how the Christians in Macedonia (or, more precisely, the Greek ecclesiastics) during the 13th and 14th centuries understood the significance of Cyril and Methodius and their disciples to the Slavonic world. According to it the two brothers, in spite of persecution, went about Bulgaria converting the people to the Orthodox faith. After translating the Bible from Greek into "simple Bulgarian" they went together to Rome with Nahum and Clement, where Adrian met them. No mention is made of the relics of St. Clement of Rome. It is stressed that many miracles took place because of the arrival of the Slavonic teachers. Pope Adrian approved of their translated books and, together with the priests and the people, bade them farewell. All this is narrated with much embellishment. Cyril, "being old and feeble," died in Rome. The others arrived at Illyricum by sea and then went to the German and Hungarian lands, where the people, holding the Apollinarian heresy, persecuted and imprisoned them. After an earthquake they left the prison and the town and reached the land of Bulgaria. Boris welcomed them and, in accordance with their desire, sent

³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁶ *Russkaya beseda*, 1859, II, 136-44.

³⁷ "Zhitiya Sv. Nauma . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 1-51.

them to preach throughout Bulgaria. Clement became " Archbishop of Moravia " and lived to a ripe old age, assisted by Nahum. After Clement's death Nahum went to the other side of the lake, where he died.

It can be seen that, although this *Vita* professes to be about Nahum, there is hardly any detail of his life, and the few facts relating to him, especially those at the end, are at variance with the old *Vita*.

The significance of Nahum lies in the fact that, humbly and quietly, he continued the great work of his masters Cyril and Methodius. In North-East Bulgaria, besides his preaching and teaching among the Slavonic masses, he encouraged the younger scholars at the Royal monastery to create and develop a Slavonic literature. His labour was not in vain, because, thanks to his efforts and those of his colleagues, the Golden Era of Bulgarian literature dawned under the protection and encouragement of Simeon. But, besides contributing to the intellectual movement of North-East Bulgaria, Nahum continued the vast educational activities of Clement and, following in his footsteps, tried to satisfy the simple spiritual needs of the masses in Macedonia. Maybe Nahum was a simple soul and therefore never dared to write anything, yet he certainly carried on the living tradition of the great masters Cyril and Methodius, and was the link between the two literary centres. He remains a symbol to remind us of the intellectual and spiritual achievements of the reigns of Boris and Simeon.

METHODIE KUSSEFF.